

REMARKS

Claims 12 to 24 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Claims 12 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,468 to Murphy et al. ("Murphy reference"). The Murphy reference claims priority to a U.S. patent provisional application filed on September 3, 1998. The present application has an international filing date of April 15, 1998, and claims priority to German Patent Application No. 19717948 having a filing date of April 29, 1997. Accordingly, the Murphy reference cannot serve as prior art to the present application. In view of this, Applicants respectfully submit that any rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are moot over the Murphy reference; and, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of those rejections of the claims.

Claims 18 to 20, and 23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Murphy reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,836,008 to Goumillou ("Goumillou reference").

As explained above, the Murphy reference cannot serve as a prior art document to the present application.

The Goumillou reference taken alone does not teach or even suggest each of the features of claims 18 to 20, and 23.

Claims 18 to 20 depend from claim 12. Claim 23 recites features analogous to those of claim 12. Claim 12 concerns a method for transmitting information including using a data structure that is defined by a formal language called Abstract Syntax Notation One, and transmitting the information encoded as text.

The Goumillou reference purportedly concerns a system for transmitting information between a source and a receiver via a network to which is connected telecommunications equipment (comprised of a plurality of interfaces for various communication services) and an interface between the telecommunications equipment and external administration equipment. See Abstract. However, the Goumillou reference does not describe or even suggest at least the features of claim 12, which include using a data structure that is defined by a formal language called Abstract Syntax Notation One and transmitting the information encoded as text.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Murphy reference cannot serve as a prior art reference to the present application, and the Goumillou reference taken alone does not describe or even suggest features of claim 12. Since claims 18 to 20 depend from claim 12, and claim 23 recites features analogous to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 to 20 and 23 are allowable; and

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Murphy and Goumillou references.

Claim 21, 22, and 24, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Murphy reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,950 to Rigori et al. ("Rigori reference").

As explained above, the Murphy reference cannot serve as a prior art document to the present application.

The Rigori reference taken alone does not teach or even suggest each of the features of claims 21, 22, and 24.

Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 12. Claim 24 recites features analogous to those of claim 12. Claim 12 concerns a method for transmitting information including using a data structure that is defined by a formal language called Abstract Syntax Notation One, and transmitting the information encoded as text.

The Rigori reference purportedly concerns an applications programming interface to a telecommunications management network having a command language interpreter and a compiler. See Abstract. The interpreter includes interpreter scripts for converting the network management parameters between the command string format and a network management protocol compatible format. *Id.* The compiler compiles interpreter scripts for encoding and decoding user defined parameter types, which are then loaded dynamically to the interpreter. *Id.* The Rigori reference does not describe or even suggest at least the features of claim 12, which include using a data structure that is defined by a formal language called Abstract Syntax Notation One and transmitting information encoded as text.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Murphy reference cannot serve as a prior art reference to the present application, and the Rigori reference taken alone does not describe or even suggest features of claim 12. Since claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 12, and claim 24 recites features analogous to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21, 22, and 24, are allowable; and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Murphy and Rigori references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of all claims be withdrawn, and that all claims be held allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of all of the above, it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a) rejections of claims 12 to 24 have been obviated, and that all currently pending claims 12 to 24 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the further clarifications above, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

If for any reason the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

Dated: Dec. 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted, By: [Signature]
By: R.L. Mayer Reg. No. 47084
Richard L. Mayer
(Reg. No. 22,490)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
1-212-425-7200